

July 28

lion building—more than \$2 million in interest to begin with. Oh, how a printer or any businessman would enjoy being able to raise money at no cost. But he cannot; and the Government cannot.

The cost of renovating the old building could be ascertained but it has not been, yet it was assumed there would be no renovation cost. This is ridiculous.

The argument is made that the building would cost \$47 million. Every Senator knows that it would cost much more than that. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has used the figure of \$46,700,000. That was the cost estimated last December. But now the cost we are told is already \$47,287,000. In 6 months it has gone up \$100,000 a month. All Senators know how much it would cost 6 or 7 years from now, by the time the building was finished. It would cost 30 to 40 percent more than is estimated at the present time, based upon all the established cost of buildings which have been erected in the District heretofore.

Finally, once this \$2½ million is committed, it will not be committed for a study. Let us not deceive ourselves. Once we commit the \$2½ million, that will be it. There will never be any further argument about it.

Unless an extraordinary situation develops, it will mean that we shall be spending not \$2½ million, or \$47 million, but \$60 to \$70 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], and the Sena-

tor from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 495 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Byrd, Va.
Case
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas

Hartke
Javits
Keating
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Proudy

Proxmire
Robertson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—60

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Browster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong

Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalfe

Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson
Beall
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Hart
Hickenlooper

Hill
Johnston
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McCarthy

Miller
Neuberger
Pearson
Ribicoff
Russell
Stennis
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 10723) was passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Presiding Officer appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BARTLETT,

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. KUCHEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1173, H.R. 10939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10939) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no debate on the bill tonight. There will be no further votes. When all remarks are completed, it is the intention to have the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

THE ESCALATING WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial from Aviation Week & Space Technology of July 20, 1964, entitled "The Escalating War."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ESCALATING WAR

In the same week that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara staged a full-scale press briefing on his claims to have saved \$2.5 billion in Defense Department operations during the last fiscal year, bad news from Vietnam confirmed the growing suspicion here and abroad that the United States is losing the only war that it currently is attempting to fight. The contrast between the elaborate display of Pentagon bookkeeping and the increasing casualties in southeast Asia may offer a clue as to why history's evaluation of Mr. McNamara's Pentagon service may be that he was an efficient storekeeper but a poor director of combat operations.

Despite the continual pronouncements of optimism emanating from Mr. McNamara and his official spokesmen, there is mounting evidence that the position of the United States and its South Vietnam ally is deteriorating under an increased offensive by the Chinese-supported Vietcong and Pathet Lao. In what was cheerily hailed 7 months ago as an indication that the Communists were losing that war, some 1,000 U.S. military personnel were withdrawn from Vietnam. Now it is announced that an initial increment of 600 U.S. troops will have to return to that country. We suspect that further substantial increases will be necessary as soon as presidential campaign politics make it domestically palatable.

VIETNAMESE DESERTIONS

We find it ironic that Mr. McNamara, in the midst of his official cost reduction week,

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the complete text of a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States relating to the savings of \$4.5 million, resulting from the construction of the new building.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request, we have reviewed certain information made available to us by the Government Printing Office to support its contention made before your committee that, if appropriately designed new quarters are built for the Printing Office, its operating expenses would be reduced by approximately \$3 million a year and the space it presently occupies would have a rental value to the General Services Administration of approximately \$1.5 million a year.

We were informed that definite building plans had not yet been prepared for a new Government Printing Office building. Under these circumstances the estimating of prospective production expenses is necessarily speculative and to the extent that various persons are involved in preparing the total estimate the component estimates would be influenced by different ideas as to what facilities and arrangements are desirable. Whether the different views are compatible for final planning has not been determined.

In general, the comparison that indicated a potential difference of \$2,984,000 between annual operating costs in the quarters currently occupied and annual operating costs if such operations were carried on in the prospective quarters, gave principal consideration to the increased efficiency and coordination that would be expected if the various activities were carried on in quarters designed especially with this objective in mind. Of special importance would be the advantage of production in a single-level structure rather than in the present multi-story structure. The use of elevators for moving materials and products is expected to be largely avoided. Also, the expectation is that the proposed quarters will be surrounded with a protective fence thus limiting entrance to the plant and making possible a considerable reduction in the present guard force.

All the major operating costs of the Printing Office seem to have been considered in preparing the estimate of potential savings, and on the basis of our review of the principal parts of the estimate, we are generally satisfied that the estimates were prepared with care within the limits of information presently available.

The following brief summary indicates the basis of the principal parts of the savings anticipated:

Reduction of labor costs by handling materials in production areas on one level instead of on several levels. A reduction of 47 percent of present costs is contemplated-----	\$582,000
Reduction in employee costs required for production in prospective quarters compared with costs in quarters presently occupied. Reduction enabled by improved consolidation and coordination of work-----	900,000

Reduction of labor costs and other expenses related to handling and managing paper and materials in storage areas-----	\$656,000
Reduction in number of elevator operators and reduction of maintenance and other elevator and conveyor expenses-----	353,000
Reduction of guards and cleaning personnel and reduced expenses of Superintendent of Documents' operations-----	345,000
Subtotal-----	2,836,000
Miscellaneous other identified reductions-----	148,000

Total estimated reduction in operating costs----- 2,984,000

The rental value of \$1.5 million on the space presently occupied by the Government Printing Office is predicated on there being 107,209 square feet suitable for office space, 594,933 square feet for industrial space, and 322,874 square feet for storage space. The annual rental rates of these space areas, as is (before renovation costs), were stated by the General Services Administration to be \$3, \$1.50, and \$1 a square foot, respectively, for a total rental value of \$1,537,000. We checked the approximate accuracy of the space areas and the classifications of space, and we receive the assurance of a responsible General Services Administration official that the rental rates provided are reasonably conservative under present-day conditions.

The costs of renovating the Government Printing Office for purposes of the new uses have not been determined.

We trust that the information herein will serve your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. In view of all of these facts, I believe that the committee recommendation for the construction of a new Government Printing Office is sound and in the best interests of the Government.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will not be approved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to emphasize two points which the Senator from Arizona made. First, do I correctly understand that the General Accounting Office recommended the construction of the new printing office building?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Second, as I understand, if everything were carried through as it is recommended by the General Accounting Office, the building would amortize itself in 10 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Third, it will not cut down very much, if at all, on outside printing. The printing will be less expensive.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are certain things which cannot be done by outside printers—for example, the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No private industry could undertake that kind of job.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we find that the site which has been selected is not satisfactory, and the plans will not work, we shall not have to go further in another year.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct. We have enough money to make a thorough investigation. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what it amounts to. While it seems like a large amount of money to make an investigation, it certainly is worth while, so that we may know where we are headed, when the time comes, if we decide to do it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is my belief that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin should be defeated. I say this not because I doubt the sincerity or the study which has gone into his presentation and his conviction, but because I feel that in this instance we are really helping the taxpayer by moving in the direction of this necessary study, to bring the Government Printing Office into an operation which would be more economical not only for the Congress, but also for the country as a whole.

I have checked into this problem very carefully. I have talked with the Public Printer, because I was concerned about the matter. I asked him to come to my office so that I might talk with him, in company with certain printers who represent that important industry and who felt that the program might involve the opening of a door which might affect a certain amount of legitimate printing by private industry.

I am convinced that if this building is found feasible, if it is constructed, and if the printing goes forward as anticipated by the Public Printer, the private printing industry will continue to function as it has operated. It will do not only a considerable share but an even larger share of the printing, and the public will be better served.

That is the reason why I earnestly hope that the amendment will not be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute to summarize my position before the vote is taken on my amendment.

Once again, the printing industry has gone on record; and on the basis of a careful study it states that the amount of printing done by the Government Printing Office of \$82 million a year would justify not a \$50 million building, not a \$40 million building, but only a \$10 million building.

There is no question that we have not made the kind of study which should be made, as to how much saving can be effected by still using the old building but utilizing modern machinery which provides virtually 90 percent of the savings in the printing industry—as anyone who has been in the printing industry knows.

The \$47 million cost estimate is not an accurate estimate because a reading will show that it does not include a nickle of the cost of the more than a million dollars in interest to construct a \$50 mil-

announced that the only manner in which the high desertion rate from the South Vietnam Army could be stopped was by a substantial pay increase. It would appear that more spending proved necessary to stem Communist gains in Vietnam.

It is evident that the Chinese Communists with their Laotian and North Vietnam allies are pushing hard to force a military decision before the U.S. presidential election in November clears the way for heavy countermeasures. There is little doubt that either President Johnson or Senator GOLDWATER, once the electorate verdict is registered, will move strongly in southeast Asia. Unless the Communists can gain control of the critical areas in South Vietnam this year they may lose their chance forever.

This is why the kind of war Mr. McNamara has been directing in South Vietnam is so important and why its lack of current success is so critical.

The war in Vietnam is the second major confrontation between the Chinese Communists and the United States in Asia. There are many significant contrasts between the first in Korea and what is now transpiring in southeast Asia. In Korea, the United States was backed by the United Nations and had combat forces of at least 10 nations fighting with its troops. In Vietnam, even the alleged allies of SEATO have been conspicuous by their absence, although the Australians belatedly sent a few military advisers and a half-dozen Caribou transports. In Vietnam, the Communists have employed guerrilla tactics and infiltration to avoid the consequences of the tremendous air and ground firepower used by the United States to chew up their massed armies in Korea. In Korea, it was eventually possible to develop the native South Koreans into solid combat troops. But it is doubtful if this will ever be possible with the Indo-Chinese because of their milder temperament.

ELECTION YEAR POLICY

President Johnson has been attempting to develop a stronger and more effective policy in Vietnam within the limits of election year constraints. It is obvious that something more than flag-waving tours of the rice paddies by General Khanh and Mr. McNamara is required. One of the main tasks facing President Johnson in southeast Asia is convincing the Chinese that he really means business and will not shrink from escalating the conflict unless they withdraw. The air strike into Communist strongholds in Laos by USAF F-100 fighter-bombers was intended to demonstrate this determination. The deployment of Marines to the Asiatic periphery was another effort to make this point. But the Chinese Communists are used to a few bloody noses and don't scare easily. Their recently increased offensive in Vietnam indicates that it will take more substantial force and determination to swerve them from the goal that now appears to be so close to their grasp.

Mr. McNamara's war in Vietnam has been a failure. Now President Johnson has turned to a combat-tested veteran, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, to try his hand from the field instead of the Pentagon. In the meantime, the price of losing the war in southeast Asia is rising and the cost of achieving victory there also is escalating fast.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last paragraph of the editorial reads:

Mr. McNamara's war in Vietnam has been a failure. Now President Johnson has turned to a combat-tested veteran, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, to try his hand from the field instead of the Pentagon. In the meantime, the price of losing the war in southeast Asia is rising and the cost of achieving victory there also is escalating fast.

I completely agree with the observations and arguments presented in the

editorial. The editorial was written and published prior to the very unfortunate decision of this administration to send several thousand more American boys to South Vietnam, many of whom will undoubtedly die in an unconstitutional war.

I am preparing a major speech on the war in South Vietnam on the basis of the conditions that have developed since the behind-the-scenes decision of this administration to escalate the war was consummated. If anyone thinks that the war is not being escalated at the present time, he could not be more mistaken. It is an unfortunate tragedy in American foreign policy. I had hoped that the administration would finally come to its senses and recognize that it is outside the pale of both the Constitution and our international law commitments to escalate the war. I intended the major speech that I am now preparing to document again the international law obligations that the U.S. Government owes not only to the people of the United States, but also to the people of the world who believe in settling disputes that threaten the peace of the world by resort to the rule of law rather than the jungle law of American unilateral military force.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON THE FAIR ALLOCATION OF CRUDE OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I announce that the Select Committee on Small Business will hold hearings on August 10 and 11 on the allocation of quotas of crude oil under the mandatory oil import program, and the impact of such allocations upon small independent refiners and on the structure of the oil industry.

These hearings will be a part of a fact-finding study which has been in progress for 2 years, during which the committee has been gathering information in cooperation with representatives of industry and Government departments. The preliminary results of the committee study were published in its 14th annual report filed on July 9, 1964. The committee found that the number of companies owning oil refineries has declined nearly 40 percent over the past 13 years from 223 to 139, and that the trends during the 5 years of the import program have continued to run against the small refiner.

The hearings will present an opportunity for further development of information and analysis of the causes and possible solutions. I hope that all segments of the oil industry will give the committee, and through it the Congress, their best thinking, so that judgments can be reached on the basis of a balanced record. Those who have an interest in this subject are encouraged to contact the committee to indicate whether they might wish to make some contribution to the study at this time or in the future.

AMENDMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a motion to reconsider Senate bill

1666 passed earlier today. Many Senators believe that certain sections of the bill should be discussed on the floor of the Senate. They are not necessarily opposed to Senate bill 1666, but I feel that some debate and discussion of certain controversial sections of the bill would be appropriate. I do not seek immediate action upon the motion; I merely ask that the motion be entered and placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Minnesota will be entered and placed on the calendar.

TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK G. DUTTON—A REMARKABLE PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations has announced his resignation from that position. He has served the executive branch—and the Congress—in a truly remarkable manner. Members of the Congress of both political parties will agree, I believe, that his achievements in impressing upon the State Department the full understanding of the right of the Congress to be informed and to be heard in the formulation of foreign policy, have been truly remarkable. I cast no aspersions on the State Department, nor upon its dedicated and patriotic career officials when I suggest that Fred Dutton, with his basic grasp of the proper role of the legislature in foreign policy, has made a significant contribution to a more productive, two-way relationship between this body and the State Department.

Mr. Dutton enjoyed the full confidence of the able and distinguished Secretary of State Mr. Rusk; and that within itself is a tribute to the good judgment of the Secretary.

It has been a great pleasure to me to watch the evolution of this two-way relationship during Fred Dutton's tenure. His insistence upon the duty of the Department to serve the Congress has improved the service each of us has been able to render constituents, and the way in which we have been able to participate in the great debates on foreign policy. Our criticisms and our constructive suggestions—and those of our constituents—have been answered, not with overly defensive reiteration of the status quo, but with constructive and courageous comment by the Department. We have had opened up top-level departmental consideration of the individual problems brought to our attention by citizens and to the Department's attention by us. Questions and decisions that might otherwise have taken months to wend their way through the labyrinth of Foggy Bottom have been handled quickly, decisively, and forthrightly.

From my own special vantage point on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have watched Fred Dutton's work with great admiration. He has worked tirelessly and effectively to counteract the view held by some that the legislative body is something to be put up with, rather than to work with.

Fred Dutton has been equally effective—and for it I give him special credit—in defending the State Department and the Foreign Service against the unfounded criticisms of those who explain away their own frustrations and fears by assuming that the universe is one vast conspiracy against their little vision of what is right. He has courageously and vigorously defended the State Department against unfair criticisms and vicious attacks by the best technique ever invented; namely, the truth.

But of greater lasting benefit to the way in which we formulate our foreign policy the lines of communication which Fred Dutton has helped open and firm up between this Hill and the State Department. I spent one afternoon over at the Department of State with Senators HICKENLOOPER and PELL, at the instance of Fred Dutton, telling its assembled senior officers what was wrong with them and the Department. I might add we received a very good reception. We have had new junior officers of the State Department intern in our offices up here on the Hill as part of their training. We have seen top-level Department action to encourage Department officers to come to the Hill and talk frankly with their Congressmen. We and our staffs have regularly been offered for the first time briefings of both a classified and general nature up here on the Hill, to help keep us in touch with the latest details of international affairs. And we have the full opportunity at these briefings to question freely key policy officials of the Department.

Many of us on the Hill who have had the opportunity to work with Fred Dutton have been impressed by his grasp of foreign policy and diplomacy from strategic planning to an individual immigration case. Noted for his energy, commonsense—and fearlessness, I might add—this outstanding American has been described by some high officials over at State as having done as much as any other single individual in at least the last several decades to close the gap between Congress and that Department, and give State a full picture of the inescapable dramatic side of foreign policy.

A Californian with long experience in private industry, in State Government, and of the White House prior to joining the State Department, Frederick Dutton is a wise choice, and further example of President Johnson's quick eye for good men.

President Johnson's choice of Fred Dutton as director for the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention, and as director of research and information for the Democratic National Committee is another example of Lyndon B. Johnson's outstanding ability to find the right man for the most challenging assignments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to add my tribute to that of the Senator from Minnesota with reference to Fred Dutton. Fred Dutton has done a very fine job in promoting liaison between the State Department and the Congress of the United States. I am sure those of us who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee have been

particularly aware of the fine, outstanding job he has done.

We have been fortunate over the years that I have been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee—this is true of both Democratic and Republican administrations—in having very fine liaison men between the State Department and the Congress.

While I regret to see Fred Dutton leave his post, I know he moves to fields of greater activity—activities he feels are such that he can make a contribution to them.

A NEW DEMOCRAT—ANGELA LORI SCHOTT, GRANDDAUGHTER OF SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns tonight, I wish to note for the Record that we have as a Member of this body one of the youngest grandfathers in the country. Last evening the distinguished Senator from Indiana, Mr. VANCE HARTKE, told me that his lovely daughter, Sandra, the wife of Larry Schott, gave birth to a lovely, sweet little girl, Angela Lori. That was at 5:05 a.m. yesterday. The Schotts are students at Indiana University in Bloomington.

Mr. President, we do not always cite grandfathers, but when a grandfather is only 45 years of age, when he is a U.S. Senator, and when he has every reason to be so proud of his wonderful family, I take this brief moment to congratulate Senator HARTKE.

I congratulate his daughter, his son-in-law, and the new Democratic voter. I serve warning upon our Republican friends that in case we fail to convince anyone, we intend at least to increase the population in a manner that will assure continuing victory for us in the trying years ahead.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do we not hold as a Democratic tenet that recruitment of youth is one of the most important bulwarks of the Democratic Party?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. A few moments ago I was privileged to address a fine gathering of young people meeting in the courtyard of the Old Senate Office Building under the auspices of the Young Citizens for President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I was happy to note that they were filled with happy enthusiasm rather than growling complaints. I was happy also to note the great joy of the occasion as compared with some of the utterances and sounds, strange and weird as they were, that I heard from San Francisco only a few weeks ago. This was a refreshing experience for me. As the Senator from Alabama has just indicated, we always look forward, first, to the understanding, the dedication and the commitment of the young people, and their active support in political elections.

We shall have to wait a little while for Miss Angela Lori Schott to be an active Democratic voter, but I assure the Senate that her first words will be some tribute to the Democratic Party and its

leadership. After all, she has a great Democratic grandfather.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I join the Senator from Minnesota in extending congratulations to our friend, VANCE HARTKE, and his entire family upon this new recruit to the Democratic cause and to their family.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR INOUE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I notice present in the the Chamber our esteemed colleague from Hawaii, Senator INOUE. When I was speaking of grandfathers, I forgot to mention a new father, too. There is a new Daniel K. Inouye—Junior—who has been enrolled in the Young Citizens for Lyndon B. Johnson.

I am so pleased I can make this announcement, as the father was too modest to do it. He is still somewhat under the effects of paternal shock. But, as an oldtimer, a grandfather twice, a father of three sons and a daughter, I can make this announcement without any emotion whatsoever, Senator. I am pleased to do so. I congratulate him and his lovely wife.

FINE PUBLIC SERVICE OF FRANK HOFFMANN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senate concludes its business, on a very serious note, I call the attention of the Nation, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to a fine example of public service and of compassionate care extended by a fellow citizen.

I notice in this morning's Washington Post, Tuesday, July 28, 1964, on page B-2, a picture and a caption. The picture shows a swimming pool, a child, and a man. The caption reads, "He Pools His Resources for Children." The story under the caption reads:

Every Monday this summer, neighborhood teenagers clean Frank Hoffmann's pool and prepare it for an invasion of youngsters from Children's Convalescent Hospital. Hoffmann, of 6802 Karlson Court, Hyattsville, has turned his private pool into an extension of Children's Convalescent Hospital as a living memorial to his wife who died recently and first had the idea.

I know Mr. Hoffmann. He is affectionately known by many of us in Congress as "Nurdy" Hoffmann. He is legislative representative of the United Steel Workers of America, one of the great free trade unions. Our friend "Nurdy" lost his lovely wife only recently. She was a friend of our family. Mr. Hoffmann is a longtime personal friend.

I think it is a wonderful tribute to the Hoffmanns that in the days prior to the death of Mrs. Hoffmann this couple talked about what could be done as a sort of living memorial that would be helpful to the community.

Very shortly the Senate will have before it the District of Columbia appropriation bill. One of the items in that appropriation bill will be money for the Children's Hospital. Here we see a fine